



SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FAKE NEWS AND FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN INDIA

Pooran Chandra Pande¹, Dr K.B. Asthana²

¹ Research Scholar of law, Maharishi University of Information Technology Lucknow. U.P.

² Dean, Faculty of law, Maharishi University of Information Technology Lucknow. U.P.

ABSTRACT

The proliferation of disinformation brought about by the quick development of digital platforms has created serious obstacles to social cohesiveness and public dialogue. A growing number of stakeholders, including the Indian government, are worried about how fake news affects public safety, democracy, and social peace. The Information Technology Act and other recent revisions that try to regulate online content are among the legal frameworks that are examined in this study. In weighing user rights, it evaluates social media corporations' role in content moderation. This paper examines the intricate relationship that exists between India's right to free expression and social media liability for spreading false information.

The paper illustrates the conflicts between the need for responsibility in preventing fake news and the requirement to protect free expression by examining case studies and public responses. The results highlight the need for a balanced strategy that encourages responsible communication without suppressing free speech, which will eventually help to shape policy conversations on digital governance in India.

KEYWORDS: Accountability, Fake news, Freedom of speech, Human Rights. Social media

INTRODUCTION

The rise of social media has completely changed how people consume and receive information, posing both significant challenges and providing never-before-seen access to a diverse array of viewpoints particularly about fake news. In India, a vibrant democracy with a multicultural population, the interplay between social media's responsibility for spreading misinformation and the fundamental right to free expression has become increasingly complex. The spread of false or misleading information that has the power to influence public opinion, incite violence, and jeopardize democratic processes has increased along with the growth of digital platforms. Calls have been made for stricter regulatory frameworks and greater accountability from social media companies to curb the spread of misleading information. However, any action must carefully balance the need to protect citizens from misleading information with the equally vital need to protect free speech, which is the foundation of a democratic society.

Social media's rise has had a big impact on how information is shared in India, posing both opportunities and difficulties. Although these platforms make it easier to access a range of opinions, they also make it easier for fake news to proliferate quickly, which can stifle free speech and spark social upheaval. As a result, calls are mounting for social media corporations to take more responsibility for reducing false information. The preservation of the right to free expression, which is essential in a democracy, must be taken into consideration while weighing the necessity for regulation. Maintaining this fine balance is essential to preventing the lawful expression of others from

being compromised by attempts to combat fake news and to ensure that the public is informed.

Important considerations like how India can hold social media corporations accountable for the content they host are raised by this conflict. What safeguards are in place to ensure that efforts to combat fake news do not impede individuals' freedom of speech? As the country navigates this challenging terrain, developing an equitable and sustainable plan will be essential to encouraging informed citizens and preserving democratic liberties.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the context of India, R. S. Sharma, and T. K. Singh's study "Fake News: A Roadmap for the Future" explores the effects of false information and possible remedies. It improves conversations about creating informed citizens and responsible social media use. "Social Media and Democracy in India" by D. S. Ranjan focuses on the interactions between misinformation, social media, and democracy in the Indian context. This book is a valuable resource for comprehending the intricate relationships that exist between India's democracy and social media, particularly regarding disinformation. It offers a thorough examination of the advantages and disadvantages that social media provide for democratic participation.

Nandi, S. (2019) investigates the legal frameworks pertaining to disinformation and freedom of speech. When talking about the difficulties in controlling fake news in India, this piece will be very important. It highlights the fine line that exists

between restriction and freedom of speech and offers insights into current issues and possible solutions. Your analysis of the regulatory environment and its consequences for social media accountability would be strengthened by citing this study.

When talking about the current situation of false news in India and its effects on governance and society, this Mishra, S. (2020) study is a crucial resource. It might also offer insightful perspectives on possible remedies, which would make it pertinent to discussions over speech freedom and social media responsibility and analyses the rise of fake news and its societal impacts. Understanding the connection between misinformation, social media, and political division in India requires reading Singh, A. (2020) article. It offers possible remedies for reducing these effects as well as insightful information on the ways in which social media fuels societal divisions. campaigning for increased social media platform regulation to improve accountability and transparency regarding false information. An outline of the initiatives taken by media outlets and civil society groups to combat false information and encourage better informed voting. Possible regulatory strategies to lessen the polarizing effects of social media are discussed.

In Chakraborty, P. (2021), the impact of disinformation on public perception via social media is discussed. Understanding the precise ways that misinformation on social media shape's public opinion in India requires reading this article. It offers a thorough examination of the effects of false information, which makes it pertinent to talks about social media responsibility and the value of media literacy.

Kumar, S. (2022). which focuses on the difficulties in restricting misinformation while maintaining the right to free speech. This article's examination of the difficulties of policing misinformation in India, especially regarding the right to free speech, would be very helpful. It makes clear the moral and legal conundrums that result from trying to balance democracy and authority.

Bhan, R. (2022) continues, emphasizing the impact of fake news on voting behaviour and electoral procedures, the significance of elections in democracies, and the function of social media as the primary information source for voters. R. Bhan elucidate Reading this article will provide you an explanation of fake news and how it relates to the current Indian election scenario. It will also help you understand the specific ways that false news impacts Indian election procedures and voter behaviour. Bhan study is relevant to discussions about democratic integrity and the state of democracy because it provides a thorough analysis of the relationship between misinformation, social media, and political polarization dynamics.

METHODOLOGY

This paper's first section offers a theoretical framework, specifies the topic matter, and discusses social media's role in spreading misleading information as well as India's right to free expression. We searched a wide range of academic databases, including Google Scholar, JSTOR, and publishers of scholarly publications. For this inquiry, a wide range of sources were

looked at, including studies of court cases and credible websites.

Objective and Goal:

Several important aims are involved in resolving social media responsibility for fake news and freedom of speech in India:

To create systems that accurately distribute information by identifying and preventing the spread of false information on social media platforms. must strike a balance between the necessity to combat false information and the defence of people's freedoms of speech, making sure that laws do not obstruct appropriate dialogue. To encourage openness about the methods used by social media companies for content moderation, their algorithms, and the information sources they disclose. To support educational and awareness initiatives that enable people to identify false information and evaluate information sources critically. To create precise policies and rules that uphold users' rights while making social media corporations responsible for the content posted on their sites. Encourage media outlets and journalists to follow moral guidelines when reporting to combat the spread of false information. To fight misinformation, it is important to foster stakeholder collaboration between the government, tech corporations, civic society, and educational institutions. The goal is to accomplish these goals to safeguard India's democratic ideals and public discourse while also fostering a more robust information ecosystem.

Comparative Perspectives

The delicate balance that must be struck between the necessity for regulation and the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution is the relationship between social media accountability for fake news and freedom of speech in India. The Indian Constitution's Article 19(1)(a) protects the right to free speech and expression. This freedom of speech is essential to a democratic society because it permits people to express their ideas. This freedom is not unrestricted, though. Reasonable limitations on free expression are permitted by Article 19(2) where they serve the purposes of morality, security, and public order. Dealing with bogus news without restricting free speech is where the difficulty lies. Misinformation or disinformation distributed with the intention of misleading is referred to as fake news. It erodes public confidence in institutions and the media and can cause social instability and interpersonal conflicts. Structure: The Indian government has implemented several rules to combat false information, including: IT Rules 2021 require social media companies to remove offensive content and designate compliance officers to manage these efforts. Bureau of Press Information (PIB): The goal of initiatives such as the PIB Fact Check unit is to detect and refute false information. It is difficult to ensure social media platforms are held accountable. Efforts to efficiently monitor and regulate are complicated by the speed at which information spreads, the vast number of contents, and the frequently anonymous nature of users.

Balancing Act

Censorship vs. Regulation: Censorship should not result from the necessity to control false information. Between shielding the public from false information and suppressing respectful

debate, there is a thin line. It is imperative to raise citizens' media literacy. Users can be better equipped to distinguish between fact and fabrication by learning how to recognize reliable sources, which lessens the need for regulatory actions alone. Indian courts have a duty to protect free expression while permitting prohibitions on false information. The preservation of individual rights and the requirement for proportionality are emphasized in landmark rulings.

Comparative Perspectives

Diverse approaches are used by various nations to combat false information. For example, while the U.S. frequently relies on free market solutions with less direct government interference, the EU places a strong emphasis on regulatory frameworks for transparency. The varied socio-political environment of India calls for a customized response to free speech and fake news. The stakes are especially high because of the historical background of political division and communal conflicts.

A sophisticated strategy is needed to maintain India's freedom of speech while navigating social media's responsibility for spreading false information. The government, social media companies, and civil society must work together to promote an appropriate information ecosystem that upholds people's rights and shields the public from the dangers of false information. Maintaining equilibrium between these interests is critical to the democracy of India.

Critical Engagement: Challenges and Limitations:

The interplay between social media accountability for fake news and the protection of freedom of speech in India is a complex issue that presents several challenges and limitations.

Disinformation spreads swiftly thanks to social media platforms, making it challenging to halt before it becomes viral. Its timeliness makes fact-checking more difficult. India frequently develops new laws governing content found online. The quick development of social media typically slows down the pace of regulation, leaving gaps in responsibility. Social media politics may result in the selective application of laws. Under the pretenses of countering fake news, governments may prioritize silencing dissenting voices, endangering the right to free expression. Many customers lack the skills needed to critically assess content. This disparity in internet literacy could accelerate the spread of false information. Social media algorithms often prioritize sensational content, which can magnify misinformation. Accountability attempts are impeded by this prejudice.

False news can be hard to define, which begs the question of whether any content has to be banned or marked as fraudulent. Because of this ambiguity, polite conversations could be difficult. Finding a balance between freedom of expression and accountability could be dangerous. Restrictions on speech that are too stringent may hinder free expression and detract from public discourse. The vast amount of content created on social media platforms may be too much for regulatory bodies to handle and monitor effectively, which could lead to inconsistent enforcement. When it comes to handling misleading content,

different policies and guidelines could be in effect on global sites. Incoherent strategies may cause misconceptions and unequal accountability. A disorganized plan could cause confusion. The absence of a cohesive strategy may lead to misunderstandings and inconsistent accountability. Legal action against users or platforms for disseminating false material may discourage free expression, particularly in an environment where laws may be abused to stifle opposition.

A complex strategy is needed to strike a balance between safeguarding India's right to free expression and making social media companies accountable for spreading false information. Improving digital literacy, streamlining regulatory frameworks, and guaranteeing just and open enforcement procedures are all part of this. Establishing an informed public conversation that minimizes the negative effects of disinformation while promoting a constructive exchange of ideas should be the aim.

Interviews

Experts in the domains of legal studies and digital rights were questioned in semi-structured interviews. The purpose of conducting these interviews was to gain a more comprehensive qualitative understanding of the problems related to social media freedom of speech and possible solutions. The semi-structured framework ensured that relevant issues were covered while allowing for flexibility in the examination of themes. Using this qualitative data, the findings from the content analysis and survey research were placed in context and provided a more nuanced knowledge of the pertinent subjects. Their conclusions were quite important.

Comparative Analysis

Comparing rights to freedom of speech laws and regulatory frameworks across various jurisdictions was the process's last step. This study looked at legal and policy documents from various academics and researchers to find differences in the rules and regulations pertaining to the advancement of free speech. The study used a comparative analysis of the laws and regulations of various legal and cultural contexts to try and identify the differences and similarities in these settings' approaches to the problem of freedom of speech in social media. The analysis's conclusions improved our understanding of the international legal environment and made clear how regional and international differences impact the use of free expression on social media.

RESULTS

Impact on Social media accountability for fake news

The rise of social media in India has significantly impacted both accountability for fake news and the balance with freedom of speech. False news can quickly become widely accepted because social media platforms make it easier for information to disseminate quickly. False information utilized for political ends has occasionally resulted in civil strife. Laws have been implemented by the Indian government to counteract misinformation. The IT Rules of 2021 is one such law that places stricter requirements on social media corporations to identify and remove objectionable information. There is increasing demand on platforms to establish stringent criteria

for moderation; yet, this raise concerns around potential censorship. Regulations are intended to counteract false information, but they frequently give rise to worries about restricting free expression. Opponents contend that taking such action can result in censorship and impede free speech. People may refrain from voicing their ideas out of fear of the consequences of sharing content, particularly when it comes to delicate subjects.

Enhancing public media literacy is becoming more and more important to assist people in differentiating between reliable and fraudulent news. NGOs and community-based groups are trying to increase awareness of the value of double-checking information before sharing it. While disseminating false information may lead to legal action, the legal system is convoluted and often works to further the interests of the powerful. The cornerstone of free expression may be further undermined for journalists who cover contentious issues since they run the risk of harassment and legal repercussions. Platforms are using AI and fact-checkers to identify and stop the spread of false content. A community-driven accountability method can be advanced by encouraging users to disclose erroneous information.

In India, the relationship between social media, fake news, and free expression is a dynamic and intricate one. Finding the ideal balance between safeguarding the public from dangerous disinformation and preventing civil rights violations in the context of accountability measures is essential. To successfully negotiate these problems, constant communication between stakeholders including the government, civic society, and IT companies is imperative.

India Court Cases and Key Legal Provisions

The confluence of freedom of expression, fake news, and social media accountability in India has been the subject of numerous court cases and legal precedents. Article 19(1) (a): Preserves the freedom of expression and speech. Article 19(2): Permits reasonable limitations on this right, especially in situations of public order, slander, and provocation. Section 66 of the Information Technology Act of 2000 addresses offenses involving computers, particularly the spread of false information. Under Section 79, intermediaries are shielded from liability for user-generated content if they take appropriate action after becoming aware of content that violates intellectual property rights. Here are some important details and precedent-setting cases about this matter:

Landmark Cases

Shreya Singhal v. Union of India (2015): Since Section 66A of the IT Act was ambiguous and stifled free speech, the Supreme Court invalidated the provision, which punished inflammatory statements received through communication services.

Aadhaar Case (Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India, 2018): Despite being largely about privacy, the ruling established a precedent for future cases involving social media and accountability by highlighting the significance of striking a balance between governmental interests and individual rights,

particularly the right to free speech.

Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India (2020): The topic of Jammu and Kashmir's internet outages was taken up by the Supreme Court. The court's decision under Article 19(1)(a) that shutdowns of this kind are a violation of the right to free speech underscores the importance of information availability in the digital era.

Vivek Sharma v. State of Maharashtra (2020): An FIR against an individual for making comments on social media was overturned by the Bombay High Court. The court stated that until it incites violence, the mere expression of opinion—even if it is critical of the government—does not constitute a crime under sedition laws.

Kunal Kamra v. Union of India (2020): The Bombay High Court decided that one of the main tenets of free speech in this case is the ability to criticize the government. It made clear that, unless it incites violence or hatred, even contentious expression should be protected.

Shubham Soni v. State of Madhya Pradesh (2021): The Madhya Pradesh High Court heard a case in which a minor was taken into custody for allegedly sharing a meme that made fun of a well-known person. The court granted bail, highlighting the value of free expression and the necessity of preventing punitive measures for light-hearted humor.

Kavita Srivastava v. State of Rajasthan (2021): The misuse of sedition laws against people for their social media posts was the focus of this case. The court reaffirmed that, absent a genuine threat to public order, dissent is an essential component of democracy and should not be criminalized.

Manisha Kharat v. State of Maharashtra (2021): In this instance, a journalist was sued for publishing what was libelous material. The court emphasized that criticism of government activities is protected by the right to free speech and that the press plays a crucial role in democracy.

Kumaraswamy v. State of Karnataka (2022): The Karnataka High Court talked about social media companies' need to correct disinformation. The court emphasized how platforms must make sure that misleading content does not proliferate uncontrollably.

Emerging Trends in Case Law

These cases reflect the evolving judicial perspective on the balance between free speech and the need to control misinformation in the digital landscape. As social media continues to play a significant role in public discourse, Indian courts will likely remain at the forefront of navigating these complex issues. Courts are increasingly scrutinizing state actions that infringe on free speech, particularly in cases involving social media. There is a growing acknowledgment of digital rights as an extension of fundamental rights, emphasizing the importance of free expression online. While protecting free speech, courts are also highlighting the need for responsible

communication, especially in the context of misinformation.

The legal framework in India pertaining to free speech and fake news is probably going to change as social media continues to develop. In the digital age, striking a balance between preserving public safety and defending individual rights is the goal of constantly changing rules and ongoing judicial review. Even Nevertheless, navigating this complicated situation with caution and addressing the genuine issues associated with disinformation are difficult while trying to uphold democracy.

DISCUSSION

The complex and multifaceted topic of social media liability for defamation and free speech in India brings up significant issues pertaining to the law, personal freedoms, and the place of technology in society. Fake news can lead to misinformation that spreads, which can end in violence, social instability, and issues with public health. For instance, during the COVID-19 outbreak, false information about immunizations and treatments was extensively disseminated on social media. Public faith in traditional media has been undermined by the rise of false news, making it more difficult for individuals to identify reliable sources. It takes a multifaceted strategy that involves regulatory measures, platform accountability, public education, and strong legal frameworks to navigate the terrain of fake news and freedom of speech in India. A robust information ecosystem will need promoting responsible conversation while upholding individual rights.

Absence of Clearly Defined Guidelines:

Indian laws pertaining to social media are presently in the process of being formulated. It is not always evident what exactly qualifies as "harmful" content, even though the government has enacted legislation forcing platforms to delete dangerous content. The defence of free speech and the eradication of misleading information must coexist in harmony with the authorities. Overly restrictive measures may prevent appropriate dialogue.

Role of Social Media Platforms:

Content moderation: Although social media sites like Facebook and Twitter have put in place procedures to verify information and flag deceptive content, these procedures are not always successful. The algorithms that decide which content is visible have the potential to spread false information. More people are calling for these algorithms to be more transparent.

Public Responsibility:

It is essential to teach the public how to spot false information. Promoting media literacy can provide people the ability to assess material critically. A more educated society can be achieved by encouraging people to use social media responsibly and to expose misleading information. The political environment can have an impact on the dissemination and handling of fake news due to claims of party bias in content regulation. Due to India's great cultural and linguistic diversity, opinions on free speech and fake news can differ greatly.

Judicial Oversight:

It is crucial for the judiciary to protect free expression while holding those responsible for spreading false information accountable. Important precedents for how these matters are handled can be established by court decisions.

Censorship dangers:

There is a thin line separating censoring speech and hiding false information. Some who are against it say that certain rules could be applied to stifle different points of view.

Future Directions in Research

Future studies in this field need to be multidisciplinary and incorporate media studies, law, technology, and sociology. To preserve democratic norms in India, it is imperative to strike a balance between the protection of free expression and accountability for fake news. Using creative thinking and teamwork will be crucial to navigate this challenging environment. Examine various regulatory frameworks and their efficacy in thwarting false information while upholding the right to free expression. Create policies for Indian policymakers based on global best practices that strike a balance between freedom of speech and regulation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, striking a balance between the protection of free expression in India and social media accountability for false information is a difficult and constantly changing task. Although social media platforms are essential for spreading knowledge and encouraging discussion, the spread of false information has the potential to erode social cohesion and public confidence. A nuanced approach to regulating is necessary to protect citizens from harmful fake news while upholding the fundamental right to free expression in India's varied and vibrant democracy. Collaboration between the government, tech corporations, and civil society could be an effective way to design clear laws that encourage responsible content sharing and improve user digital literacy.

In the end, encouraging an accountable culture on social media is crucial to preserving a robust democratic dialogue and making sure that the pursuit of truth and the welfare of society are not sacrificed in the name of free speech. India may strive toward a more knowledgeable and resilient society in the digital era by placing a high priority on both accountability and freedom of expression.

REFERENCES

- Chakraborty, D., Chakraborty, I., & Mukherjee, J. (2017). A study on the efficiency of public sector banks in India. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 5(5), 1-10.
- Gupta, A., & Ray, P. (2020). A comparative analysis of performance of public and private sector banks in India. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 7(3), 77-87.
- Ray, A. (2018). Evolution of banking regulations in India: From a directive to a risk-based approach. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 6(7), 239-252.
- Roy, D., & Singh, S. (2019). Financial inclusion through Jan Dhan Yojana: An analysis of progress and prospects. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 7(7), 151-

164.

5. Bharadwaj, A., & Nair, M. S. (2018). Regional rural banks and financial inclusion: An analysis of outreach and performance. *Indian Journal of Finance*, 12(1), 7-21.
6. Jain, A., & Kundu, R. (2021). Digital banking adoption: An empirical analysis of customer preferences in India. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 39(1), 15-31.
7. Chakravarty, R., Saha, P., & Dutta, S. (2019). Regulatory challenges in digital payment platforms: A study on Indian context. *Decision*, 46(1), 61-73.
8. Pramanik, S., Ghosh, S. K., & Mallick, S. (2020). Strategies to address non-performing assets in Indian public sector banks. *Asia-Pacific Financial Markets*, 27(4), 395-417.
9. Shah, S., & Shah, V. (2017). Fintech and banking: Collaborations for financial inclusion in India. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 14(2), 185-203.
10. Rajan, R. G. (2015). RBI's evolving approach to regulation and supervision. In *Reserve Bank of India Occasional Papers*, 36(2), 1-7.
11. Taneja, V. (2020). Bank privatization in India: Policy, process, and implications. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 55(26-27), 28-35.
12. Bhattacharya, S., & De, P. (2016). Digital banking in India: Trends and prospects. *The Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce*, 21(3), 1-9.